

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Patent Application of:	)	<b>Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents</b>
	)	
Matthew J. CANNON et al.	)	Group Art Unit: 2616
	)	
Application No.: 10/761,375	)	Examiner: R. Jain
	)	
Filed: January 22, 2004	)	
	)	
For: ADDRESS DEFINITION FOR IP	)	
TELEPHONY SERVICES	)	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Customer Window, Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

**APPEAL BRIEF**

This Appeal Brief is submitted in response to the final Office Action, dated November 29, 2006, and in support of the Notice of Appeal, filed March 29, 2007.

I. **REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The real party in interest in this appeal is Verizon Business Global LLC, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Verizon Communications Inc.

II. RELATED APPEALS, INTERFERENCES, AND JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS

Appellants are unaware of any related appeals, interferences or judicial proceedings.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 25-27, 29-32, 34-36, 38-40, and 42-46 are pending in this application. Claims 1-24, 28, 33, 37, and 41 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 25-27, 29-32, 34-36, 38-40, and 42-46 were finally rejected in the final Office Action, dated November 29, 2006, and are the subject of the present appeal. These claims are reproduced in the Claim Appendix of this Appeal Brief.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendment was filed subsequent to the final Office Action, dated November 29, 2006. Appellants filed a Request for Reconsideration on February 28, 2007. A subsequent Advisory Action, dated March 23, 2007, indicated that the Request for Reconsideration has been considered, but did not place the application in condition for allowance.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

In the paragraphs that follow, a concise explanation of the independent claims, each dependent claim argued separately, and the claims reciting means-plus-function or step-plus-function language that are involved in this appeal will be provided by referring, in parenthesis, to examples of where support can be found in the specification and drawings.

Claim 25 is directed to a method for establishing a telephone call. The method comprises

receiving a call establishment request (e.g., Fig. 2; page 4, lines 3-11); mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format (e.g., Fig. 2; page 2, line 29 to page 3, line 5; page 5, lines 10-17); and establishing the telephone call based on the mapping (e.g., Fig. 2; page 4, lines 3-19).

Claim 26 recites mapping a numbering plan indicator from the first format to the session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format (e.g., Fig. 2; page 2, line 29 to page 3, line 5; page 5, lines 10-17).

Claim 27 recites that the establishing is further based on the mapping of the numbering plan indicator (e.g., Fig. 2; page 4, lines 3-19).

Claim 29 recites that the first format includes one of signaling system 7 (SS7) format, integrated services digital network (ISDN) format, ISDN user part (ISUP) format, or channel associated signaling (CAS) format (e.g., page 4, lines 3-19).

Claim 30 is directed to a method for establishing a telephone call. The method comprises receiving a call establishment request (e.g., Fig. 2; page 4, lines 3-11); mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format (e.g., Fig. 2; page 2, line 29 to page 3, line 5; page 5, lines 10-17); and establishing the telephone call based on the mapping (e.g., Fig. 2; page 4, lines 3-19).

Claim 31 recites mapping a nature of address indicator from the first format to the session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format (e.g., Fig. 2; page 2, line 29 to page 3, line 5; page 5, lines 10-17).

Claim 32 recites that the establishing is further based on the mapping of the nature of

address indicator (e.g., Fig. 2; page 4, lines 3-19).

Claim 34 recites that the first format includes one of signaling system 7 (SS7) format, integrated services digital network (ISDN) format, ISDN user part (ISUP) format, or channel associated signaling (CAS) format (e.g., page 4, lines 3-19).

Claim 35 is directed to a system that comprises means for mapping a nature of address indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format (e.g., 41, Fig. 2; page 2, line 29 to page 3, line 5; page 5, lines 10-17); and means for mapping a nature of address indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format (e.g., 41, Fig. 2; page 2, line 29 to page 3, line 5; page 5, lines 10-17).

Claim 36 recites means for translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format (e.g., 41, Fig. 2; page 2, line 29 to page 3, line 5; page 5, lines 10-17).

Claim 38 recites that the second format includes one of signaling system 7 (SS7) format, integrated services digital network (ISDN) format, ISDN user part (ISUP) format, or channel associated signaling (CAS) format (e.g., page 4, lines 3-19).

Claim 39 is directed to a system for establishing a call. The system comprises means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format (e.g., 41, Fig. 2; page 2, line 29 to page 3, line 5; page 5, lines 10-17); and means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format (e.g., 41, Fig. 2; page 2, line 29 to page 3, line 5; page 5, lines 10-17).

Claim 40 recites means for translating a nature of address indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format (e.g., 41, Fig. 2; page 2, line 29 to page 3, line 5;

page 5, lines 10-17).

Claim 42 recites that the second format includes one of signaling system 7 (SS7) format, integrated services digital network (ISDN) format, ISDN user part (ISUP) format, or channel associated signaling (CAS) format (e.g., page 4, lines 3-19).

Claim 43 is directed to a system comprising a network device (e.g., 41, Fig. 2) to translate a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format (e.g., page 2, line 29 to page 3, line 5; page 5, lines 10-17), and translate a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format (e.g., page 2, line 29 to page 3, line 5; page 5, lines 10-17).

Claim 44 is directed to a method for translating data. The method includes translating a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format (e.g., Fig. 2; page 2, line 29 to page 3, line 5; page 5, lines 10-17); and translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format (e.g., Fig. 2; page 2, line 29 to page 3, line 5; page 5, lines 10-17).

Claim 46 recites that the second format includes one of signaling system 7 (SS7) format, integrated services digital network (ISDN) format, ISDN user part (ISUP) format, or channel associated signaling (CAS) format (e.g., page 4, lines 3-19).

## VI. GROUND S OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

A. Claims 25-27, 29-32, 34-36, 38-40, and 42-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over SHANKER et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,570,869) in view of PURCELL et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,578).

VII. ARGUMENTS

- A. **The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SHANKER et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,570,869) in view of PURCELL et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,578) should be reversed.**

The initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* basis to deny patentability to a claimed invention always rests upon the Examiner. In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In rejecting a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Examiner must provide a factual basis to support the conclusion of obviousness. In re Warner, 379 F.2d 1011, 154 U.S.P.Q. 173 (CCPA 1967). Based upon the objective evidence of record, the Examiner is required to make the factual inquiries mandated by Graham v. John Deere Co., 86 S.Ct. 684, 383 U.S. 1, 148 U.S.P.Q. 459 (1966). KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (April 30, 2007). The Examiner is also required to explain how and why one having ordinary skill in the art would have been realistically motivated to modify an applied reference and/or combine applied references to arrive at the claimed invention. Uniroyal, Inc. v. Rudkin-Wiley Corp., 837 F.2d 1044, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1434 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

1. Claim 25.

Independent claim 25 is directed to a method for establishing a telephone call. The method includes receiving a call establishment request, mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, and establishing the telephone call based on the mapping. SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. do not disclose or suggest mapping

a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format. The Examiner relies on col. 1, lines 30-37, col. 2, lines 44-67, and col. 5, lines 15-32, of SHANKAR et al. for allegedly disclosing converting to a session initiation protocol and on col. 3, lines 5-14, col. 4, lines 50-57, col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37, the Abstract, and Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. for allegedly disclosing mapping a nature of address indicator (final Office Action, pp. 2-4). Appellants submit that the Examiner's piecemeal examination of the above feature of claim 25 is clearly unreasonable and does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Instead of addressing the feature of mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to the session initiation protocol or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, the Examiner breaks the feature down into illogical parts by pointing to portions of one reference for allegedly disclosing converting a first message format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format and to unrelated portions of a second reference for allegedly disclosing mapping a nature of address indicator. Such attempts at reconstructing Appellants' claims are clearly impermissible. Moreover, the Examiner does not explain why one skilled in the art at the time of Appellants' invention would seek to modify SHANKER et al. or PURCELL et al. to include mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to the session initiation protocol or from the first format to the session initiation protocol.

Appellants submit that while SHANKAR et al. may disclose the session initiation protocol, SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol

format to the first format, as recited in claim 25. The Examiner cannot reasonably rely on SHANKAR et al. for disclosing this feature of claim 25 since the Examiner admits that SHANKAR et al. does not disclose mapping a nature of address indicator (final Office Action, p. 3).

Nonetheless, at col. 1, lines 25-37, SHANKAR et al. discloses:

Over the decades, however, major voice carriers have invested heavily in developing a Signaling System 7 (SS7) signaling and switching infrastructure to offer reliable telephone service. This infrastructure includes countless systems for billing, provisioning, maintenance, and databases that are compatible only with SS7. These systems are commonly referred to "legacy systems," a term that also includes other proprietary protocols such as ISDN\_PRI, DPNSS, ISUP, TUP, NUP, H.323, and SIP. Due to the substantial investment in the legacy systems, it is desirable to keep the legacy systems in operation, yet still take advantage of the newer packet technologies.

This section of SHANKAR et al. discloses that the term "legacy systems" includes the session initiation protocol (SIP). This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 25. In fact, this section of SHANKAR et al. in no way relates to mapping.

At col. 2, lines 44-67, SHANKAR et al. discloses:

More specifically, mechanisms are provided for handing the Layer 3 voice signaling of a voice call by a signaling apparatus and the Layer 2 voice traffic of the voice call by coding units. The signaling apparatus implements signaling interworking and protocol conversion, if necessary, between the legacy systems and the packet-switching network. The coding units convert bearer voice traffic between legacy and packet formats and, in some configurations, groom and backhaul the signaling information for the voice to the signaling apparatus. By separating the processing for voice signaling from handling the voice data, a flexible solution for integrating with legacy systems is attained.

One aspect of the invention involves a telecommunications network that includes a packet-switching network, such as an IP, ATM, or frame relay network, at least



two coding units coupled to the packet-switching network and to an originating node and a terminating node, respectively, and a signaling apparatus coupled to the coding units. The first of the two coding units is configured, among other things, to transmit its network address to the signaling apparatus and, in one embodiment, signaling data associated with the voice call. The second coding unit is controllable to establish a bearer channel with the first coding unit through the packet-switching network for the voice call.

This section of SHANKAR et al. discloses a signaling apparatus that implements protocol conversion between the legacy systems and the packet-switching network. This section of SHANKAR et al. further discloses a coding unit that converts bearer voice traffic between legacy and packet formats. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 25.

At col. 5, lines 15-32, SHANKAR et al. discloses:

The originating signaling unit 120 and the terminating signaling unit 140 implement a "virtual switch" and are responsible for processing and routing the signaling messages that are exchanged to set up and tear down a voice connection. Thus, the signaling units perform such functions as call resolution, call routing, bearer selection, and generation of call detail records (CDRs) for billing management. In one embodiment, the signaling units also convert the legacy protocols of the originating node 100 and the terminating node 160, such as DPNSS, ISDN\_PRI, SS7/C7 (including ISUPs, TUPs, and NUPs), H.323, SIP, or CAS, into messages for communicating with one another and for controlling a coding unit over control links 114 and 154. Control links 114 and 154 can be implemented over IP or ATM and, in fact, on the same channel as the respective backhaul signaling link 112 and 152, respectively. Through the control link, a coding unit is controlled by a signaling unit, for example, to establish a bearer channel for the voice data over the packet-switching network 130.

This section of SHANKAR et al. discloses that a signaling unit converts legacy protocols, such as SIP, of originating node 100 and terminating node 160 into messages for communicating with one another and for controlling a coding unit over control lines 114 and 154. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests that the conversion of legacy protocols

includes mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 25.

With respect to PURCELL et al., Appellants note that PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest a session initiation protocol format. Therefore, the Examiner cannot reasonably rely on PURCELL et al. for disclosing mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 25.

Nonetheless, at col. 3, lines 5-14, PURCELL et al. discloses:

It is an object of the present invention to convert signals in a format associated with a first international communications network into a different format required by a second international communications network. It is an object of the present invention to process the translation of a subscriber's global title address from the type of global title addressing used by a first communications network into the type required by the second communications network.

This section of PURCELL et al. discloses the conversion of signals in a format associated with a first international communications network into a different format required by a second international communications network. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 25.

At col. 4, lines 50-57, PURCELL et al. discloses:

Preferably, the necessary protocol conversions are accomplished through the use of look-up tables or conversion tables. The conversion tables contain the necessary information for translating messages from the North American message format into the foreign message format, and visa versa. Alternatively, protocol conversion could also be implemented through the use of neural networks or digital signal processing elements.

This section of PURCELL et al. discloses the use of conversion tables for translating messages

from the North American message format into a foreign message format. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 25.

At col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37, PURCELL et al. discloses mapping tables that can be used in translating ANSI Signaling Connection Control Part (SCCP) global title formats and values into the ITU SCCP global title formats and values. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 25.

In the Abstract, PURCELL et al. discloses:

A gateway unit which acts to provide interoperability between disparate mobile communications networks. The gateway unit provides the necessary protocol conversions between the different mobile networks. The gateway unit can be a stand-alone unit or co-located with a mobile switching center (MSC) within North America or in foreign country. In each case, the gateway unit serves as an interconnection point between two or more networks. For example, the gateway unit converts messages from European networks, which use the International Telecommunications Union (ITU) and mobile global title (MGT) protocols to North American networks, which use the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) and international mobile station identity address (IMSI) protocols, and vice versa. The gateway unit preferably includes the elements of a processor, software and memory, all of which could be provided on a circuit board or in a conventional personal computer. Preferably, the conversions are performed through the use of a series of look-up tables, stored in the memory. Once the incoming messages, from a first communications network, have been converted, subsequently, they are forwarded to their destination in the second communications network.

This section of PURCELL et al. discloses protocol conversion between different mobile networks. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest mapping a nature of

address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 25.

Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. depict mapping tables used in the translation of ANSI SCCP global title formats and values into ITU SCCP global title formats and values. These figures (and their corresponding description) specifically disclose that the translation of an ANSI SS7 protocol to an ITU SS7 protocol is based on a translation type value. For example, at col. 8, lines 4-9, PURCELL et al. specifically discloses, with reference to Fig. 6a:

The gateway unit 90 performs this translation by equating the Translation Type=9 (123) to the Numbering Plan=ITU E.212 (125), Encoding Scheme=BCD Odd/Even 127, and Nature of Address Indicator=International 129, used in the ITU SS7 protocol.

(Emphasis added). Therefore, in stark contrast to the above feature of claim 25, PURCELL et al. discloses the mapping of a translation type value to numbering plan, encoding scheme, and nature of address indicator values of a different protocol. PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 25. In fact, as indicated above, PURCELL et al. does not even mention the session initiation protocol.

With respect to the above arguments, the Examiner alleges that Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. show examples of mapping tables used in the translation process between ANSI and ITU formats and points to col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37 (discussed above) of PURCELL et al. for support (final Office Action, p. 7). Regardless of the veracity of the Examiner's allegation, PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 25.

Further in response to the above arguments, the Examiner provides definitions of "nature of address" and "numbering plan indicator" and the Examiner's impressions of how telecommunication switches typically work (final Office Action, p. 7).

Contrary to the Examiner's definition, a numbering plan indicator, as the name suggests, is a value that identifies a numbering plan for a call. For example, a numbering plan indicator value of "1" indicates an ISDN telephony call, according to the E.164 numbering plan.

Moreover, Appellants submit that the Examiner's characterization of the operations of telecommunication switches (regardless of its veracity) does not remedy the fact that neither SHANKAR et al. nor PURCELL et al. discloses or suggests mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 25. As indicated above, Appellants submit that the Examiner's piecemeal examination of this feature (by pointing to SHANKAR et al. for disclosing the session initiation protocol and PURCELL et al. for disclosing translation of ANSI SCCP global title formats and values into ITU SCCP global title formats and values) is unreasonable.

Since SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. do not disclose or suggest mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. cannot disclose or suggest establishing a telephone call based on the mapping, as also recited in claim 25.

SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. do not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 25. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been

established with respect to claim 25.

Appellants further submit that one skilled in the art at the time of Appellants' invention would not have been motivated to incorporate PURCELL et al.'s alleged nature of address conversion into the SHANKAR et al. system, absent impermissible hindsight. With respect to motivation, the Examiner alleges:

it would have been obvious ... to incorporate both an NOA and NPI within Shanker so as to allow for continuous and smooth interconnect of communications path between different network interfaces

(final Office Action, pp. 4 and 8). Appellants submit that the Examiner's allegation is merely a conclusory statement regarding an alleged benefit of the combination. Such motivation statements are insufficient for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In this respect, Appellants rely upon KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (April 30, 2007) (citing In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)), where it was held that rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. Appellants submit that the Examiner's purported motivation to combine the cited references is merely conclusory and based on impermissible hindsight.

Moreover, the Examiner believes it is reasonable to conclude that incorporating a nature of address indicator into the SHANKAR et al. system would "allow for continuous and smooth interconnect of communications path between different network interfaces." Thus, by incorporating this indicator into the SHANKAR et al. system, the Examiner believes that it is reasonable to conclude that the SHANKAR et al. system would somehow be capable of a continuous and smooth interconnect of a communications path between different network

interfaces. Appellants submit that this allegation is far-fetched at best and not supported by any facts. Clearly, the Examiner's motivation for combining pieces of two different documents to reconstruct the above feature of claim 25 is impermissibly based on hindsight.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

2. Claim 26.

Claim 26 depends from claim 25. Therefore, this claim is patentable over SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 25. Moreover, this claim recites an additional feature not disclosed or suggested by SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al.

For example, claim 26 recites mapping a numbering plan indicator from the first format to the session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format. The Examiner relies on col. 1, lines 30-37, col. 2, lines 44-67, and col. 5, lines 15-32, of SHANKAR et al. for allegedly disclosing converting to a session initiation protocol and on col. 3, lines 5-14, col. 4, lines 50-57, col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37, the Abstract, and Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. for allegedly disclosing mapping a numbering plan indicator (final Office Action, pp. 4-6). Appellants submit that the Examiner's piecemeal examination of the above feature of claim 26 is clearly unreasonable.

Instead of addressing the feature of mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, the Examiner breaks the feature down into illogical parts by pointing to portions of one

reference for allegedly disclosing converting from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format and to unrelated portions of a second reference for allegedly disclosing mapping a numbering plan indicator. Such attempts at reconstructing Appellants' claims are clearly impermissible. Moreover, the Examiner does not explain why one skilled in the art at the time of Appellants' invention would seek to modify SHANKER et al. or PURCELL et al. to include mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to the session initiation protocol or from the session initiation protocol to the first format.

Appellants note that while SHANKAR et al. may disclose the session initiation protocol, SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 26. The Examiner cannot reasonably rely on SHANKAR et al. for disclosing this feature of claim 26 since the Examiner admits that SHANKAR et al. does not disclose mapping a numbering plan indicator (final Office Action, p. 5).

Nonetheless, col. 1, lines 25-37 of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above and discloses that the term "legacy systems" includes SIP. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 26. In fact, this section of SHANKAR et al. in no way relates to mapping.

Col. 2, lines 44-67 of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above and discloses a signaling apparatus that implements protocol conversion between the legacy systems and the packet-switching network. This section of SHANKAR et al. further discloses a coding unit that converts



bearer voice traffic between legacy and packet formats. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 26.

Col. 5, lines 15-32 of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above and discloses that a signaling unit converts legacy protocols, such as SIP, of originating node 100 and terminating node 160 into messages for communicating with one another and for controlling a coding unit over control lines 114 and 154. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests that the conversion of legacy protocols includes mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 26.

With respect to PURCELL et al., Appellants note that PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest a session initiation protocol format. Therefore, the Examiner cannot reasonably rely on PURCELL et al. for disclosing mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 26.

Nonetheless, col. 3, lines 5-14, of PURCELL et al. is reproduced above and discloses the conversion of signals in a format associated with a first international communications network into a different format required by a second international communications network. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 26.

Col. 4, lines 50-57, of PURCELL et al. is reproduced above and discloses the use of conversion tables for translating messages from the North American message format into a foreign message format. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 26.

At col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37, PURCELL et al. discloses mapping tables that can be used in translating of ANSI Signaling Connection Control Part (SCCP) global title formats and values into the ITU SCCP global title formats and values. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 26.

The Abstract of PURCELL et al. is reproduced above and discloses protocol conversion between different mobile networks. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 26.

Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. depict mapping tables used in the translation of ANSI SCCP global title formats and values into ITU SCCP global title formats and values. These figures (and their corresponding description) specifically disclose that the translation of an ANSI SS7 protocol to an ITU SS7 protocol is based on a translation type value. For example, at col. 8, lines 4-9, PURCELL et al. specifically discloses, with reference to Fig. 6a:

The gateway unit 90 performs this translation by equating the Translation Type=9 (123) to the Numbering Plan=ITU E.212 (125), Encoding Scheme=BCD Odd/Even 127, and Nature of Address Indicator=International 129, used in the ITU SS7 protocol.

(Emphasis added). Therefore, in stark contrast to the above feature of claim 26, PURCELL et al. discloses the mapping of a translation type value to numbering plan, encoding scheme, and nature of address indicator values of a different protocol. PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 26. In fact, as indicated above, PURCELL et al. does not even mention the session initiation protocol.

SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. do not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 26. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claim 26.

Appellants further submit that one skilled in the art at the time of Appellants' invention would not have been motivated to incorporate PURCELL et al.'s alleged numbering plan conversion into the SHANKAR et al. system, absent impermissible hindsight. With respect to motivation, the Examiner alleges:

it would have been obvious ... to incorporate both an NOA and NPI within Shanker so as to allow for continuous and smooth interconnect of communications path between different network interfaces

(final Office Action, p. 6). Appellants submit that the Examiner's allegation is merely a conclusory statement regarding an alleged benefit of the combination. Such motivation statements are insufficient for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In this respect, Appellants rely upon KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (April 30, 2007) (citing In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)), where it was held that rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of

obviousness. Appellants submit that the Examiner's purported motivation to combine the cited references is merely conclusory and based on impermissible hindsight.

Moreover, the Examiner believes it is reasonable to conclude that incorporating a nature of address indicator and a numbering plan indicator into the SHANKAR et al. system would "allow for continuous and smooth interconnect of communications path between different network interfaces." Thus, by incorporating these two indicators into the SHANKAR et al. system, the Examiner believes that it is reasonable to conclude that the SHANKAR et al. system would somehow be capable of a continuous and smooth interconnect of a communications path between different network interfaces. Appellants submit that this allegation is far-fetched at best. Clearly, the Examiner's motivation for combining pieces of two different documents to reconstruct the above feature of claim 26 is impermissibly based on hindsight.

For at least these additional reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

3. Claim 27.

Claim 27 depends from claim 26. Therefore, claim 27 is patentable over SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 26. Moreover, this claim recites an additional feature not disclosed or suggested by SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al.

Claim 27 recites that the establishing the telephone call based on mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format is further based on the mapping of the numbering

plan indicator. The Examiner appears to admit that SHANKAR et al. does not disclose this feature and relies on Figs. 6a-6c and col. 7, line 65 to col. 8, line 35, of PURCELL et al. for allegedly disclosing the above feature of claim 27 (final Office Action, p. 6). Appellants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of PURCELL et al.

Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. depict mapping tables used in the translation of ANSI SCCP global title formats and values into ITU SCCP global title formats and values. These figures (and their corresponding description) specifically disclose that the translation of an ANSI SS7 protocol to an ITU SS7 protocol is based on a translation type value. For example, at col. 8, lines 4-9, PURCELL et al. specifically discloses, with reference to Fig. 6a:

The gateway unit 90 performs this translation by equating the Translation Type=9 (123) to the Numbering Plan=ITU E.212 (125), Encoding Scheme=BCD Odd/Even 127, and Nature of Address Indicator=International 129, used in the ITU SS7 protocol.

(Emphasis added). Therefore, in stark contrast to the above feature of claim 26, PURCELL et al. discloses the mapping of a translation type value to numbering plan, encoding scheme, and nature of address indicator values of a different protocol. PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest that the establishing the telephone call based on mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format is further based on the mapping of the numbering plan indicator from the first format to the session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 27. In fact, as indicated above, PURCELL et al. does not even mention the session initiation protocol.

At col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37, PURCELL et al. discloses mapping tables that can be used in translating of ANSI Signaling Connection Control Part (SCCP) global title formats and

values into the ITU SCCP global title formats and values. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest that the establishing the telephone call based on mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format is further based on the mapping of the numbering plan indicator from the first format to the session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 27.

With respect to motivation, the Examiner alleges:

it would have been obvious ... to incorporate both an NOA and NPI within Shanker so as to allow for continuous and smooth interconnect of communications path between different network interfaces

(final Office Action, pp. 4 and 6). Appellants submit that the Examiner's allegation is merely a conclusory statement regarding an alleged benefit of the combination. Such motivation statements are insufficient for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In this respect, Appellants rely upon KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (April 30, 2007) (citing In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)), where it was held that rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. Appellants submit that the Examiner's purported motivation to combine the cited references is merely conclusory and based on impermissible hindsight.

Moreover, the Examiner believes it is reasonable to conclude that incorporating a nature of address indicator and a numbering plan indicator into the SHANKAR et al. system would "allow for continuous and smooth interconnect of communications path between different network interfaces." Thus, by incorporating these two indicators into the SHANKAR et al.

system, the Examiner believes that it is reasonable to conclude that the SHANKAR et al. system would somehow be capable of a continuous and smooth interconnect of a communications path between different network interfaces. Appellants submit that this allegation is far-fetched at best and not supported by any facts. Clearly, the Examiner's motivation for combining pieces of two different documents to reconstruct the above feature of claim 27 is impermissibly based on hindsight.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

4. Claim 29.

Claim 29 depends from claim 25. Therefore, claim 29 is patentable over SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 25. Moreover, this claim recites an additional feature not disclosed or suggested by SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al.

Claim 29 recites that the first format includes one of signaling system 7 (SS7) format, integrated services digital network (ISDN) format, ISDN user part (ISUP) format, or channel associated signaling (CAS) format. The Examiner relies on col. 1, lines 25-37, and col. 4, line 50 to col. 5, line 27, of SHANKAR et al. for allegedly disclosing this feature (final Office Action, p. 6). At the outset, Appellants note that the Examiner admits that SHANKAR et al. does not disclose mapping a nature of address indicator (final Office Action, p. 3). Therefore, it is unclear how the Examiner can reasonably rely on SHANKAR et al. for disclosing mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol or from the session initiation

protocol to the first format, where the first format includes one of SS7 format, ISDN format, ISUP format, or CAS format, as recited in claim 29.

Nonetheless, col. 1, lines 25-37, of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above and discloses that the term "legacy systems" includes ISDN\_PRI, DPNSS, ISUP, TUP, NUP, H.323, and SIP. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests mapping a nature of address indicator from a session initiation protocol to a first format or from the session initiation protocol to the first format, where the first format includes one of SS7 format, ISDN format, ISUP format, or CAS format, as recited in claim 29. In fact, this section of SHANKAR et al. in no way relates to mapping.

At col. 4, line 50 to col. 5, line 27, SHANKAR et al. discloses that originating signaling unit 120 and terminating signaling unit 140 convert the legacy protocols, such as DPNSS, ISDN\_PRI, SS7/C7 (including ISUPs, TUPs, and NUPs), H.323, SIP, or CAS, of originating node 100 and terminating node 160 into messages for communicating with one another and for controlling a coding unit over control lines 114 and 154. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests that the conversion of legacy protocols includes mapping a nature of address indicator from a session initiation protocol to a first format or from the session initiation protocol to the first format, where the first format includes one of SS7 format, ISDN format, ISUP format, or CAS format, as recited in claim 29.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

5. Claim 30.



Independent claim 30 is directed to a method for establishing a telephone call. The method includes receiving a call establishment request, mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, and establishing the telephone call based on the mapping. SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. do not disclose or suggest mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format. The Examiner appears to rely on SHANKAR et al. for allegedly disclosing converting to the session initiation protocol and on PURCELL et al. for allegedly disclosing mapping a numbering plan indicator (final Office Action, pp. 2-4). Appellants submit that the Examiner's piecemeal examination of the above feature of claim 30 is unreasonable.

Instead of addressing the feature of mapping a numbering plan indicator from a session initiation protocol to a first format or from the session initiation protocol to the first format, the Examiner breaks the feature down into illogical parts by pointing to portions of one reference for allegedly disclosing mapping a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format and to a second reference for allegedly disclosing mapping a numbering plan indicator. Such attempts at reconstructing Appellants' claims are clearly impermissible. Moreover, the Examiner does not explain why one skilled in the art at the time of Appellants' invention would seek to modify SHANKER et al. or PURCELL et al. to include mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol or from a session initiation protocol to a first format.

Nevertheless, the Examiner relies on col. 1, lines 30-37, col. 2, lines 44-67, and col. 5, lines 15-32, of SHANKAR et al. for allegedly disclosing converting to a session initiation protocol and on col. 3, lines 5-14, col. 4, lines 50-57, col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37, the Abstract, and Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. for allegedly disclosing mapping a numbering plan indicator (final Office Action, pp. 4-6). Appellants submit that these sections of SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. do not disclose or suggest the above feature of claim 30.

At the outset, while SHANKAR et al. may disclose the session initiation protocol, Appellants submit that SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 30. The Examiner cannot reasonably rely on SHANKAR et al. for disclosing this feature of claim 30 since the Examiner admits that SHANKAR et al. does not disclose mapping a numbering plan (final Office Action, p. 3).

Nonetheless, col. 1, lines 25-37, of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above and discloses that the term "legacy systems" includes SIP. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 30. In fact, this section of SHANKAR et al. in no way relates to mapping.

Col. 2, lines 44-67, of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above and discloses a signaling apparatus that implements protocol conversion between the legacy systems and the packet-switching network. This section of SHANKAR et al. further discloses a coding unit that converts bearer voice traffic between legacy and packet formats. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no

way discloses or suggests mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 30.

Col. 5, lines 15-32, of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above and discloses that a signaling unit converts legacy protocols, such as SIP, of originating node 100 and terminating node 160 into messages for communicating with one another and for controlling a coding unit over control lines 114 and 154. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests that the conversion of legacy protocols includes mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 30.

With respect to PURCELL et al., Appellants note that PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest a session initiation protocol format. Therefore, the Examiner cannot reasonably rely on PURCELL et al. for disclosing mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 30.

Nonetheless, col. 3, lines 5-14, of PURCELL et al. is reproduced above and discloses the conversion of signals in a format associated with a first international communications network into a different format required by a second international communications network. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 30.

Col. 4, lines 50-57, of PURCELL et al. is reproduced above and discloses the use of

conversion tables for translating messages from the North American message format into a foreign message format. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 30.

At col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37, PURCELL et al. discloses mapping tables that can be used in translating of ANSI Signaling Connection Control Part (SCCP) global title formats and values into the ITU SCCP global title formats and values. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 30.

The Abstract of PURCELL et al. is reproduced above and discloses protocol conversion between different mobile networks. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 30.

Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. depict mapping tables used in the translation of ANSI SCCP global title formats and values into ITU SCCP global title formats and values. These figures (and their corresponding description) specifically disclose that the translation of an ANSI SS7 protocol to an ITU SS7 protocol is based on a translation type value. For example, at col. 8, lines 4-9, PURCELL et al. specifically discloses, with reference to Fig. 6a:

The gateway unit 90 performs this translation by equating the Translation Type=9 (123) to the Numbering Plan=ITU E.212 (125), Encoding Scheme=BCD Odd/Even 127, and Nature of Address Indicator=International 129, used in the ITU SS7 protocol.

(Emphasis added). Therefore, in stark contrast to the above feature of claim 30, PURCELL et al.

discloses the mapping of a translation type value to numbering plan, encoding scheme, and nature of address indicator values of a different protocol. PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 30. In fact, as indicated above, PURCELL et al. does not even mention the session initiation protocol.

Since SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. do not disclose or suggest mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. cannot disclose or suggest establishing a telephone call based on the mapping, as also recited in claim 30.

SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. do not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 30. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claim 30.

Appellants further submit that one skilled in the art at the time of Appellants' invention would not have been motivated to incorporate PURCELL et al.'s alleged numbering plan conversion into the SHANKAR et al. system, absent impermissible hindsight. With respect to motivation, the Examiner alleges:

it would have been obvious ... to incorporate both an NOA and NPI within Shanker so as to allow for continuous and smooth interconnect of communications path between different network interfaces

(final Office Action, p. 4). Appellants submit that the Examiner's allegation is merely a conclusory statement regarding an alleged benefit of the combination. Such motivation statements are insufficient for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In this respect,

Appellants rely upon KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (April 30, 2007) (citing In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)), where it was held that rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. Appellants submit that the Examiner's purported motivation to combine the cited references is merely conclusory and based on impermissible hindsight.

Moreover, the Examiner believes it is reasonable to conclude that incorporating a nature of address indicator and a numbering plan indicator into the SHANKAR et al. system would "allow for continuous and smooth interconnect of communications path between different network interfaces." Thus, by incorporating these two indicators into the SHANKAR et al. system, the Examiner believes that it is reasonable to conclude that the SHANKAR et al. system would somehow be capable of a continuous and smooth interconnect of a communications path between different network interfaces. Appellants submit that this allegation is far-fetched at best and not supported by any facts. Clearly, the Examiner's motivation for combining pieces of two different documents to reconstruct the above feature of claim 30 is impermissibly based on hindsight.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

6. Claim 31.

Claim 31 depends from claim 30. Therefore, this claim is patentable over SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the

reasons given above with respect to claim 30. Moreover, this claim recites an additional feature not disclosed or suggested by SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al.

For example, claim 31 recites mapping a nature of address indicator from the first format to the session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format. The Examiner relies on col. 1, lines 30-37, col. 2, lines 44-67, and col. 5, lines 15-32, of SHANKAR et al. for allegedly disclosing converting to a session initiation protocol and on col. 3, lines 5-14, col. 4, lines 50-57, col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37, the Abstract, and Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. for allegedly disclosing mapping a nature of address indicator (final Office Action, pp. 4-6). Appellants submit that the Examiner's piecemeal examination of the above feature of claim 31 is clearly unreasonable.

Instead of addressing the feature of mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, the Examiner breaks the feature down into illogical parts by pointing to portions of one reference for allegedly disclosing converting from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol to the first format and to unrelated portions of a second reference for allegedly disclosing mapping a nature of address indicator. Such attempts at reconstructing Appellants' claims are clearly impermissible. Moreover, the Examiner does not explain why one skilled in the art at the time of Appellants' invention would seek to modify SHANKER et al. or PURCELL et al. to include mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to the session initiation protocol or from the session initiation protocol to the first format.

Appellants note that while SHANKAR et al. may disclose the session initiation protocol,

SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 31. The Examiner cannot reasonably rely on SHANKAR et al. for disclosing this feature of claim 31 since the Examiner admits that SHANKAR et al. does not disclose mapping a nature of address indicator (final Office Action, p. 5).

Nonetheless, col. 1, lines 25-37 of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above and discloses that the term "legacy systems" includes SIP. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 31. In fact, this section of SHANKAR et al. in no way relates to mapping.

Col. 2, lines 44-67 of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above and discloses a signaling apparatus that implements protocol conversion between the legacy systems and the packet-switching network. This section of SHANKAR et al. further discloses a coding unit that converts bearer voice traffic between legacy and packet formats. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 31.

Col. 5, lines 15-32 of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above and discloses that a signaling unit converts legacy protocols, such as SIP, of originating node 100 and terminating node 160 into messages for communicating with one another and for controlling a coding unit over control lines 114 and 154. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests that the conversion of legacy protocols includes mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format



to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 31.

With respect to PURCELL et al., Appellants note that PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest a session initiation protocol format. Therefore, the Examiner cannot reasonably rely on PURCELL et al. for disclosing mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 31.

Nonetheless, col. 3, lines 5-14, of PURCELL et al. is reproduced above and discloses the conversion of signals in a format associated with a first international communications network into a different format required by a second international communications network. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 31.

Col. 4, lines 50-57, of PURCELL et al. is reproduced above and discloses the use of conversion tables for translating messages from the North American message format into a foreign message format. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 31.

At col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37, PURCELL et al. discloses mapping tables that can be used in translating of ANSI Signaling Connection Control Part (SCCP) global title formats and values into the ITU SCCP global title formats and values. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session

initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 31.

The Abstract of PURCELL et al. is reproduced above and discloses protocol conversion between different mobile networks. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 31.

Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. depict mapping tables used in the translation of ANSI SCCP global title formats and values into ITU SCCP global title formats and values. These figures (and their corresponding description) specifically disclose that the translation of an ANSI SS7 protocol to an ITU SS7 protocol is based on a translation type value. For example, at col. 8, lines 4-9, PURCELL et al. specifically discloses, with reference to Fig. 6a:

The gateway unit 90 performs this translation by equating the Translation Type=9 (123) to the Numbering Plan=ITU E.212 (125), Encoding Scheme=BCD Odd/Even 127, and Nature of Address Indicator=International 129, used in the ITU SS7 protocol.

(Emphasis added). Therefore, in stark contrast to the above feature of claim 31, PURCELL et al. discloses the mapping of a translation type value to numbering plan, encoding scheme, and nature of address indicator values of a different protocol. PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 31. In fact, as indicated above, PURCELL et al. does not even mention the session initiation protocol.

SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. do not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 31. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claim 31.

Appellants further submit that one skilled in the art at the time of Appellants' invention would not have been motivated to incorporate PURCELL et al.'s alleged nature of address conversion into the SHANKAR et al. system, absent impermissible hindsight. With respect to motivation, the Examiner alleges:

it would have been obvious ... to incorporate both an NOA and NPI within Shanker so as to allow for continuous and smooth interconnect of communications path between different network interfaces

(final Office Action, p. 6). Appellants submit that the Examiner's allegation is merely a conclusory statement regarding an alleged benefit of the combination. Such motivation statements are insufficient for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In this respect, Appellants rely upon KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (April 30, 2007) (citing In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)), where it was held that rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. Appellants submit that the Examiner's purported motivation to combine the cited references is merely conclusory and based on impermissible hindsight.

Moreover, the Examiner believes it is reasonable to conclude that incorporating a nature of address indicator and a numbering plan indicator into the SHANKAR et al. system would "allow for continuous and smooth interconnect of communications path between different network interfaces." Thus, by incorporating these two indicators into the SHANKAR et al. system, the Examiner believes that it is reasonable to conclude that the SHANKAR et al. system would somehow be capable of a continuous and smooth interconnect of a communications path between different network interfaces. Appellants submit that this allegation is far-fetched at best.

Clearly, the Examiner's motivation for combining pieces of two different documents to reconstruct the above feature of claim 31 is impermissibly based on hindsight.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

7. Claim 32.

Claim 32 depends from claim 31. Therefore, claim 32 is patentable over SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 31. Moreover, this claim recites an additional feature not disclosed or suggested by SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al.

Claim 32 recites that the establishing the telephone call based on mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format is further based on the mapping of the nature of address indicator. The Examiner appears to admit that SHANKAR et al. does not disclose this feature and relies on Figs. 6a-6c and col. 7, line 65 to col. 8, line 35, of PURCELL et al. for allegedly disclosing the above feature of claim 32 (final Office Action, p. 6). Appellants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of PURCELL et al.

Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. depict mapping tables used in the translation of ANSI SCCP global title formats and values into ITU SCCP global title formats and values. These figures (and their corresponding description) specifically disclose that the translation of an ANSI SS7 protocol to an ITU SS7 protocol is based on a translation type value. For example, at col. 8, lines 4-9, PURCELL et al. specifically discloses, with reference to Fig. 6a:

The gateway unit 90 performs this translation by equating the Translation Type=9 (123) to the Numbering Plan=ITU E.212 (125), Encoding Scheme=BCD Odd/Even 127, and Nature of Address Indicator=International 129, used in the ITU SS7 protocol.

(Emphasis added). Therefore, in stark contrast to the above feature of claim 32, PURCELL et al. discloses the mapping of a translation type value to numbering plan, encoding scheme, and nature of address indicator values of a different protocol. PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest that the establishing the telephone call based on mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format is further based on the mapping of the nature of address indicator from the first format to the session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 32. In fact, as indicated above, PURCELL et al. does not even mention the session initiation protocol.

At col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37, PURCELL et al. discloses mapping tables that can be used in translating of ANSI Signaling Connection Control Part (SCCP) global title formats and values into the ITU SCCP global title formats and values. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest that the establishing the telephone call based on mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format is further based on the mapping of the nature of address indicator from the first format to the session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format, as recited in claim 32.

With respect to motivation, the Examiner alleges:

it would have been obvious ... to incorporate both an NOA and NPI within Shanker so as to allow for continuous and smooth interconnect of communications path between different network interfaces

(final Office Action, pp. 4 and 6). Appellants submit that the Examiner's allegation is merely a conclusory statement regarding an alleged benefit of the combination. Such motivation statements are insufficient for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In this respect, Appellants rely upon KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (April 30, 2007) (citing In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)), where it was held that rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. Appellants submit that the Examiner's purported motivation to combine the cited references is merely conclusory and based on impermissible hindsight.

Moreover, the Examiner believes it is reasonable to conclude that incorporating a nature of address indicator and a numbering plan indicator into the SHANKAR et al. system would "allow for continuous and smooth interconnect of communications path between different network interfaces." Thus, by incorporating these two indicators into the SHANKAR et al. system, the Examiner believes that it is reasonable to conclude that the SHANKAR et al. system would somehow be capable of a continuous and smooth interconnect of a communications path between different network interfaces. Appellants submit that this allegation is far-fetched at best and not supported by any facts. Clearly, the Examiner's motivation for combining pieces of two different documents to reconstruct the above feature of claim 32 is impermissibly based on hindsight.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

## 8. Claim 34.

Claim 34 depends from claim 30. Therefore, claim 34 is patentable over SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 30. Moreover, this claim recites an additional feature not disclosed or suggested by SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al.

Claim 34 recites that the first format includes one of signaling system 7 (SS7) format, integrated services digital network (ISDN) format, ISDN user part (ISUP) format, or channel associated signaling (CAS) format. The Examiner relies on col. 1, lines 25-37, and col. 4, line 50 to col. 5, line 27, of SHANKAR et al. for allegedly disclosing this feature (final Office Action, p. 6). At the outset, Appellants note that the Examiner admits that SHANKAR et al. does not disclose mapping a numbering plan indicator (final Office Action, p. 3). Therefore, it is unclear how the Examiner can reasonably rely on SHANKAR et al. for disclosing mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol or from the session initiation protocol to the first format, where the first format includes one of SS7 format, ISDN format, ISUP format, or CAS format, as recited in claim 34.

Nonetheless, col. 1, lines 25-37, of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above and discloses that the term "legacy systems" includes ISDN\_PRI, DPNSS, ISUP, TUP, NUP, H.323, and SIP. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests mapping a numbering plan indicator from a session initiation protocol to a first format or from the session initiation protocol to the first format, where the first format includes one of SS7 format, ISDN format, ISUP format, or CAS format, as recited in claim 34. In fact, this section of SHANKAR et al. in no way relates to mapping.

At col. 4, line 50 to col. 5, line 27, SHANKAR et al. discloses that originating signaling unit 120 and terminating signaling unit 140 convert the legacy protocols, such as DPNSS, ISDN\_PRI, SS7/C7 (including ISUPs, TUPs, and NUPs), H.323, SIP, or CAS, of originating node 100 and terminating node 160 into messages for communicating with one another and for controlling a coding unit over control lines 114 and 154. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests that the conversion of legacy protocols includes mapping a numbering plan indicator from a session initiation protocol to a first format or from the session initiation protocol to the first format, where the first format includes one of SS7 format, ISDN format, ISUP format, or CAS format, as recited in claim 34.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

9. Claim 35.

Independent claim 35 is directed to a system comprising means for mapping a nature of address indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format; and means for mapping a nature of address indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format. SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

The Examiner relies on col. 1, lines 30-37, col. 2, lines 44-67, and col. 5, lines 15-32, of SHANKAR et al. for allegedly disclosing converting to a session initiation protocol and on col. 3, lines 5-14, col. 4, lines 50-57, col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37, the Abstract, and Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. for allegedly disclosing mapping a nature of address indicator (final Office



Action, pp. 2-4). Appellants submit that the Examiner's piecemeal examination of the above feature of claim 35 is clearly unreasonable.

Instead of addressing the features of means for mapping a nature of address indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a nature of address indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, the Examiner breaks the features down into illogical parts by pointing to portions of one reference for allegedly disclosing converting a session initiation protocol format to the second format or from the second format to the session initiation protocol format and to unrelated portions of a second reference for allegedly disclosing mapping a nature of address indicator. Such attempts at reconstructing Appellants' claims are clearly impermissible. Moreover, the Examiner does not explain why one skilled in the art at the time of Appellants' invention would seek to modify SHANKER et al. or PURCELL et al. to include means for mapping a nature of address indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a nature of address indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format.

Appellants submit that while SHANKAR et al. may disclose the session initiation protocol, SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests means for mapping a nature of address indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a nature of address indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, as recited in claim 35. The Examiner cannot reasonably rely on SHANKAR et al. for disclosing these features of claim 35 since the Examiner admits that SHANKAR et al. does not disclose mapping a nature of address indicator (final Office Action, p. 3).

Nonetheless, col. 1, lines 25-37, of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above. This section

of SHANKAR et al. discloses that the term "legacy systems" includes the session initiation protocol (SIP). This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests means for mapping a nature of address indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a nature of address indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, as recited in claim 35. In fact, this section of SHANKAR et al. in no way relates to mapping.

Col. 2, lines 44-67, of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above. This section of SHANKAR et al. discloses a signaling apparatus that implements protocol conversion between the legacy systems and the packet-switching network. This section of SHANKAR et al. further discloses a coding unit that converts bearer voice traffic between legacy and packet formats. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests means for mapping a nature of address indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a nature of address indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, as recited in claim 35.

Col. 5, lines 15-32, of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above. This section of SHANKAR et al. discloses that a signaling unit converts legacy protocols, such as SIP, of originating node 100 and terminating node 160 into messages for communicating with one another and for controlling a coding unit over control lines 114 and 154. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests that the conversion of legacy protocols includes means for mapping a nature of address indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a nature of address indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, as recited in claim 35.

With respect to PURCELL et al., Appellants note that PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest a session initiation protocol format. Therefore, the Examiner cannot reasonably rely on PURCELL et al. for disclosing means for mapping a nature of address indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a nature of address indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, as recited in claim 35.

Nonetheless, col. 3, lines 5-14, of PURCELL et al. is reproduced above. This section of PURCELL et al. discloses the conversion of signals in a format associated with a first international communications network into a different format required by a second international communications network. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest means for mapping a nature of address indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a nature of address indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, as recited in claim 35.

Col. 4, lines 50-57, PURCELL et al. is reproduced above. This section of PURCELL et al. discloses the use of conversion tables for translating messages from the North American message format into a foreign message format. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest means for mapping a nature of address indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a nature of address indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, as recited in claim 35.

At col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37, PURCELL et al. discloses mapping tables that can be used in translating ANSI Signaling Connection Control Part (SCCP) global title formats and values into the ITU SCCP global title formats and values. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest means for mapping a nature of address indicator from a session initiation

protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a nature of address indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, as recited in claim 35.

The Abstract of PURCELL et al. is reproduced above. This section of PURCELL et al. discloses protocol conversion between different mobile networks. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest means for mapping a nature of address indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a nature of address indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, as recited in claim 35.

Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. depict mapping tables used in the translation of ANSI SCCP global title formats and values into ITU SCCP global title formats and values. These figures (and their corresponding description) specifically disclose that the translation of an ANSI SS7 protocol to an ITU SS7 protocol is based on a translation type value. For example, at col. 8, lines 4-9, PURCELL et al. specifically discloses, with reference to Fig. 6a:

The gateway unit 90 performs this translation by equating the Translation Type=9 (123) to the Numbering Plan=ITU E.212 (125), Encoding Scheme=BCD Odd/Even 127, and Nature of Address Indicator=International 129, used in the ITU SS7 protocol.

(Emphasis added). Therefore, in stark contrast to the above feature of claim 35, PURCELL et al. discloses the mapping of a translation type value to numbering plan, encoding scheme, and nature of address indicator values of a different protocol. PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest means for mapping a nature of address indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a nature of address indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, as recited in claim 35. In fact, as indicated above, PURCELL et al. does not even mention the session initiation protocol.

With respect to the above arguments, the Examiner alleges that Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL

et al. show examples of mapping tables used in the translation process between ANSI and ITU formats and points to col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37 (discussed above) of PURCELL et al. for support (final Office Action, p. 7). Regardless of the veracity of the Examiner's allegation, PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest means for mapping a nature of address indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a nature of address indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, as recited in claim 35.

Further in response to the above arguments, the Examiner provides definitions of "nature of address" and "numbering plan indicator" and the Examiner's impressions of how telecommunication switches typically work (final Office Action, p. 7).

Contrary to the Examiner's definition, a numbering plan indicator, as the name suggests, is a value that identifies a numbering plan for a call. For example, a numbering plan indicator value of "1" indicates an ISDN telephony call, according to the E.164 numbering plan.

Moreover, Appellants submit that the Examiner's characterization of the operations of telecommunication switches (regardless of its veracity) does not remedy the fact that neither SHANKAR et al. nor PURCELL et al. discloses or suggests means for mapping a nature of address indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a nature of address indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, as recited in claim 35. As indicated above, Appellants submit that the Examiner's piecemeal examination of this feature (by pointing to SHANKAR et al. for disclosing the session initiation protocol and PURCELL et al. for disclosing translation of ANSI SCCP global title formats and values into ITU SCCP global title formats and values) is unreasonable.

SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. do not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 35. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claim 35.

Appellants further submit that one skilled in the art at the time of Appellants' invention would not have been motivated to incorporate PURCELL et al.'s alleged nature of address conversion into the SHANKAR et al. system, absent impermissible hindsight. With respect to motivation, the Examiner alleges:

it would have been obvious ... to incorporate both an NOA and NPI within Shanker so as to allow for continuous and smooth interconnect of communications path between different network interfaces

(final Office Action, pp. 4 and 8). Appellants submit that the Examiner's allegation is merely a conclusory statement regarding an alleged benefit of the combination. Such motivation statements are insufficient for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In this respect, Appellants rely upon KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (April 30, 2007) (citing In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)), where it was held that rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. Appellants submit that the Examiner's purported motivation to combine the cited references is merely conclusory and based on impermissible hindsight.

Moreover, the Examiner believes it is reasonable to conclude that incorporating a nature of address indicator into the SHANKAR et al. system would "allow for continuous and smooth interconnect of communications path between different network interfaces." Thus, by incorporating this indicator into the SHANKAR et al. system, the Examiner believes that it is

reasonable to conclude that the SHANKAR et al. system would somehow be capable of a continuous and smooth interconnect of a communications path between different network interfaces. Appellants submit that this allegation is far-fetched at best and not supported by any facts. Clearly, the Examiner's motivation for combining pieces of two different documents to reconstruct the above feature of claim 35 is impermissibly based on hindsight.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

10. Claim 36.

Claim 36 depends from claim 35. Therefore, this claim is patentable over SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 35. Moreover, this claim recites an additional feature not disclosed or suggested by SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al.

Claim 36 recites means for translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format. The Examiner relies on col. 1, lines 30-37, col. 2, lines 44-67, and col. 5, lines 15-32, of SHANKAR et al. for allegedly disclosing converting to a session initiation protocol and on col. 3, lines 5-14, col. 4, lines 50-57, col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37, the Abstract, and Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. for allegedly disclosing mapping a numbering plan indicator (final Office Action, pp. 4-6). Appellants submit that the Examiner's piecemeal examination of the above feature of claim 36 is clearly unreasonable.

Instead of addressing the feature of means for translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, the Examiner breaks the

feature down into illogical parts by pointing to portions of one reference for allegedly disclosing converting from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format and to unrelated portions of a second reference for allegedly disclosing mapping a numbering plan indicator. Such attempts at reconstructing Appellants' claims are clearly impermissible. Moreover, the Examiner does not explain why one skilled in the art at the time of Appellants' invention would seek to modify SHANKER et al. or PURCELL et al. to include means for translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format.

Appellants note that while SHANKAR et al. may disclose the session initiation protocol, SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests means for translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 36. The Examiner cannot reasonably rely on SHANKAR et al. for disclosing this feature of claim 36 since the Examiner admits that SHANKAR et al. does not disclose mapping a numbering plan indicator (final Office Action, p. 5).

Nonetheless, col. 1, lines 25-37 of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above and discloses that the term "legacy systems" includes SIP. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests means for translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 36. In fact, this section of SHANKAR et al. in no way relates to translating.

Col. 2, lines 44-67 of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above and discloses a signaling apparatus that implements protocol conversion between the legacy systems and the packet-switching network. This section of SHANKAR et al. further discloses a coding unit that converts



bearer voice traffic between legacy and packet formats. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests means for translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 36.

Col. 5, lines 15-32 of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above and discloses that a signaling unit converts legacy protocols, such as SIP, of originating node 100 and terminating node 160 into messages for communicating with one another and for controlling a coding unit over control lines 114 and 154. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests that the conversion of legacy protocols includes means for translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 36.

With respect to PURCELL et al., Appellants note that PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest a session initiation protocol format. Therefore, the Examiner cannot reasonably rely on PURCELL et al. for disclosing means for translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 36.

Nonetheless, col. 3, lines 5-14, of PURCELL et al. is reproduced above and discloses the conversion of signals in a format associated with a first international communications network into a different format required by a second international communications network. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest means for translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 36.

Col. 4, lines 50-57, of PURCELL et al. is reproduced above and discloses the use of conversion tables for translating messages from the North American message format into a foreign message format. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest means for translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the

second format, as recited in claim 36.

At col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37, PURCELL et al. discloses mapping tables that can be used in translating of ANSI Signaling Connection Control Part (SCCP) global title formats and values into the ITU SCCP global title formats and values. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest means for translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 36.

The Abstract of PURCELL et al. is reproduced above and discloses protocol conversion between different mobile networks. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest means for translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 36.

Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. depict mapping tables used in the translation of ANSI SCCP global title formats and values into ITU SCCP global title formats and values. These figures (and their corresponding description) specifically disclose that the translation of an ANSI SS7 protocol to an ITU SS7 protocol is based on a translation type value. For example, at col. 8, lines 4-9, PURCELL et al. specifically discloses, with reference to Fig. 6a:

The gateway unit 90 performs this translation by equating the Translation Type=9 (123) to the Numbering Plan=ITU E.212 (125), Encoding Scheme=BCD Odd/Even 127, and Nature of Address Indicator=International 129, used in the ITU SS7 protocol.

(Emphasis added). Therefore, in stark contrast to the above feature of claim 36, PURCELL et al. discloses the mapping of a translation type value to numbering plan, encoding scheme, and nature of address indicator values of a different protocol. PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest means for translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 36. In fact, as indicated above, PURCELL et

al. does not even mention the session initiation protocol.

SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. do not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 36. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claim 36.

Appellants further submit that one skilled in the art at the time of Appellants' invention would not have been motivated to incorporate PURCELL et al.'s alleged numbering plan conversion into the SHANKAR et al. system, absent impermissible hindsight. With respect to motivation, the Examiner alleges:

it would have been obvious ... to incorporate both an NOA and NPI within Shanker so as to allow for continuous and smooth interconnect of communications path between different network interfaces

(final Office Action, p. 6). Appellants submit that the Examiner's allegation is merely a conclusory statement regarding an alleged benefit of the combination. Such motivation statements are insufficient for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In this respect, Appellants rely upon KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (April 30, 2007) (citing In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)), where it was held that rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. Appellants submit that the Examiner's purported motivation to combine the cited references is merely conclusory and based on impermissible hindsight.

Moreover, the Examiner believes it is reasonable to conclude that incorporating a nature of address indicator and a numbering plan indicator into the SHANKAR et al. system would "allow for continuous and smooth interconnect of communications path between different

network interfaces." Thus, by incorporating these two indicators into the SHANKAR et al. system, the Examiner believes that it is reasonable to conclude that the SHANKAR et al. system would somehow be capable of a continuous and smooth interconnect of a communications path between different network interfaces. Appellants submit that this allegation is far-fetched at best. Clearly, the Examiner's motivation for combining pieces of two different documents to reconstruct the above feature of claim 36 is impermissibly based on hindsight.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

11. Claim 38.

Claim 38 depends from claim 35. Therefore, claim 38 is patentable over SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 35. Moreover, this claim recites an additional feature not disclosed or suggested by SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al.

Claim 38 recites that the second format includes one of signaling system 7 (SS7) format, integrated services digital network (ISDN) format, ISDN user part (ISUP) format, or channel associated signaling (CAS) format. The Examiner relies on col. 1, lines 25-37, and col. 4, line 50 to col. 5, line 27, of SHANKAR et al. for allegedly disclosing this feature (final Office Action, p. 6). At the outset, Appellants note that the Examiner admits that SHANKAR et al. does not disclose mapping a nature of address indicator (final Office Action, p. 3). Therefore, it is unclear how the Examiner can reasonably rely on SHANKAR et al. for disclosing means for mapping a nature of address indicator from a session initiation protocol to a second format and means for

mapping a nature of address indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol, where the second format includes one of SS7 format, ISDN format, ISUP format, or CAS format, as recited in claim 38.

Nonetheless, col. 1, lines 25-37, of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above and discloses that the term "legacy systems" includes ISDN\_PRI, DPNSS, ISUP, TUP, NUP, H.323, and SIP. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests means for mapping a nature of address indicator from a session initiation protocol to a second format and means for mapping a nature of address indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol, where the second format includes one of SS7 format, ISDN format, ISUP format, or CAS format, as recited in claim 38. In fact, this section of SHANKAR et al. in no way relates to mapping.

At col. 4, line 50 to col. 5, line 27, SHANKAR et al. discloses that originating signaling unit 120 and terminating signaling unit 140 convert the legacy protocols, such as DPNSS, ISDN\_PRI, SS7/C7 (including ISUPs, TUPs, and NUPs), H.323, SIP, or CAS, of originating node 100 and terminating node 160 into messages for communicating with one another and for controlling a coding unit over control lines 114 and 154. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests that the conversion of legacy protocols includes means for mapping a nature of address indicator from a session initiation protocol to a second format and means for mapping a nature of address indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol, where the second format includes one of SS7 format, ISDN format, ISUP format, or CAS format, as recited in claim 38.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. is improper. Accordingly,

Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

12. Claim 39.

Independent claim 39 is directed to a system for establishing a call. The system comprises means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format; and means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format. SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

The Examiner relies on col. 1, lines 30-37, col. 2, lines 44-67, and col. 5, lines 15-32, of SHANKAR et al. for allegedly disclosing converting to a session initiation protocol and on col. 3, lines 5-14, col. 4, lines 50-57, col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37, the Abstract, and Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. for allegedly disclosing mapping a numbering plan indicator (final Office Action, pp. 2-4). Appellants submit that the Examiner's piecemeal examination of the above feature of claim 39 is clearly unreasonable.

Instead of addressing the features of means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, the Examiner breaks the features down into illogical parts by pointing to portions of one reference for allegedly disclosing converting a session initiation protocol format to a second format or from the second format to the session initiation protocol format and to unrelated portions of a second reference for allegedly disclosing mapping a numbering plan indicator. Such attempts at reconstructing Appellants' claims are clearly impermissible. Moreover, the Examiner does not explain why one skilled in the art at the time of Appellants' invention would seek to modify SHANKER et al. or

PURCELL et al. to include means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format.

Appellants submit that while SHANKAR et al. may disclose the session initiation protocol, SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, as recited in claim 39. The Examiner cannot reasonably rely on SHANKAR et al. for disclosing these features of claim 39 since the Examiner admits that SHANKAR et al. does not disclose mapping a numbering plan indicator (final Office Action, p. 3).

Nonetheless, col. 1, lines 25-37, of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above. This section of SHANKAR et al. discloses that the term "legacy systems" includes the session initiation protocol (SIP). This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, as recited in claim 39. In fact, this section of SHANKAR et al. in no way relates to mapping.

Col. 2, lines 44-67, of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above. This section of SHANKAR et al. discloses a signaling apparatus that implements protocol conversion between the legacy systems and the packet-switching network. This section of SHANKAR et al. further discloses a coding unit that converts bearer voice traffic between legacy and packet formats. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests means for mapping a

numbering plan indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, as recited in claim 39.

Col. 5, lines 15-32, of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above. This section of SHANKAR et al. discloses that a signaling unit converts legacy protocols, such as SIP, of originating node 100 and terminating node 160 into messages for communicating with one another and for controlling a coding unit over control lines 114 and 154. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests that the conversion of legacy protocols includes means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, as recited in claim 39.

With respect to PURCELL et al., Appellants note that PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest a session initiation protocol format. Therefore, the Examiner cannot reasonably rely on PURCELL et al. for disclosing means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, as recited in claim 39.

Nonetheless, col. 3, lines 5-14, of PURCELL et al. is reproduced above. This section of PURCELL et al. discloses the conversion of signals in a format associated with a first international communications network into a different format required by a second international communications network. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from the second format to the session



initiation protocol format, as recited in claim 39.

Col. 4, lines 50-57, PURCELL et al. is reproduced above. This section of PURCELL et al. discloses the use of conversion tables for translating messages from the North American message format into a foreign message format. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, as recited in claim 39.

At col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37, PURCELL et al. discloses mapping tables that can be used in translating ANSI Signaling Connection Control Part (SCCP) global title formats and values into the ITU SCCP global title formats and values. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, as recited in claim 39.

The Abstract of PURCELL et al. is reproduced above. This section of PURCELL et al. discloses protocol conversion between different mobile networks. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, as recited in claim 39.

Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. depict mapping tables used in the translation of ANSI SCCP global title formats and values into ITU SCCP global title formats and values. These figures (and their corresponding description) specifically disclose that the translation of an ANSI SS7 protocol to an ITU SS7 protocol is based on a translation type value. For example, at col. 8,

lines 4-9, PURCELL et al. specifically discloses, with reference to Fig. 6a:

The gateway unit 90 performs this translation by equating the Translation Type=9 (123) to the Numbering Plan=ITU E.212 (125), Encoding Scheme=BCD Odd/Even 127, and Nature of Address Indicator=International 129, used in the ITU SS7 protocol.

(Emphasis added). Therefore, in stark contrast to the above feature of claim 39, PURCELL et al. discloses the mapping of a translation type value to numbering plan, encoding scheme, and nature of address indicator values of a different protocol. PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, as recited in claim 39. In fact, as indicated above, PURCELL et al. does not even mention the session initiation protocol.

With respect to the above arguments, the Examiner alleges that Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. show examples of mapping tables used in the translation process between ANSI and ITU formats and points to col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37 (discussed above) of PURCELL et al. for support (final Office Action, p. 7). Regardless of the veracity of the Examiner's allegation, PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, as recited in claim 39.

Further in response to the above arguments, the Examiner provides definitions of "nature of address" and "numbering plan indicator" and the Examiner's impressions of how telecommunication switches typically work (final Office Action, p. 7).

Contrary to the Examiner's definition, a numbering plan indicator, as the name suggests,

is a value that identifies a numbering plan for a call. For example, a numbering plan indicator value of "1" indicates an ISDN telephony call, according to the E.164 numbering plan.

Moreover, Appellants submit that the Examiner's characterization of the operations of telecommunication switches (regardless of its veracity) does not remedy the fact that neither SHANKAR et al. nor PURCELL et al. discloses or suggests means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format and means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format, as recited in claim 39. As indicated above, Appellants submit that the Examiner's piecemeal examination of this feature (by pointing to SHANKAR et al. for disclosing the session initiation protocol and PURCELL et al. for disclosing translation of ANSI SCCP global title formats and values into ITU SCCP global title formats and values) is unreasonable.

SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. do not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 39. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claim 39.

Appellants further submit that one skilled in the art at the time of Appellants' invention would not have been motivated to incorporate PURCELL et al.'s alleged nature of address conversion into the SHANKAR et al. system, absent impermissible hindsight. With respect to motivation, the Examiner alleges:

it would have been obvious ... to incorporate both an NOA and NPI within Shanker so as to allow for continuous and smooth interconnect of communications path between different network interfaces

(final Office Action, pp. 4 and 8). Appellants submit that the Examiner's allegation is merely a conclusory statement regarding an alleged benefit of the combination. Such motivation

statements are insufficient for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In this respect, Appellants rely upon KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (April 30, 2007) (citing In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)), where it was held that rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. Appellants submit that the Examiner's purported motivation to combine the cited references is merely conclusory and based on impermissible hindsight.

Moreover, the Examiner believes it is reasonable to conclude that incorporating a numbering plan indicator into the SHANKAR et al. system would "allow for continuous and smooth interconnect of communications path between different network interfaces." Thus, by incorporating this indicator into the SHANKAR et al. system, the Examiner believes that it is reasonable to conclude that the SHANKAR et al. system would somehow be capable of a continuous and smooth interconnect of a communications path between different network interfaces. Appellants submit that this allegation is far-fetched at best and not supported by any facts. Clearly, the Examiner's motivation for combining pieces of two different documents to reconstruct the above feature of claim 39 is impermissibly based on hindsight.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

13. Claim 40.

Claim 40 depends from claim 39. Therefore, this claim is patentable over SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the

reasons given above with respect to claim 39. Moreover, this claim recites an additional feature not disclosed or suggested by SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al.

Claim 40 recites means for translating a nature of address indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format. The Examiner relies on col. 1, lines 30-37, col. 2, lines 44-67, and col. 5, lines 15-32, of SHANKAR et al. for allegedly disclosing converting to a session initiation protocol and on col. 3, lines 5-14, col. 4, lines 50-57, col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37, the Abstract, and Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. for allegedly disclosing mapping a nature of address indicator (final Office Action, pp. 4-6). Appellants submit that the Examiner's piecemeal examination of the above feature of claim 40 is clearly unreasonable.

Instead of addressing the feature of means for translating a nature of address indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, the Examiner breaks the feature down into illogical parts by pointing to portions of one reference for allegedly disclosing converting from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format and to unrelated portions of a second reference for allegedly disclosing mapping a nature of address indicator. Such attempts at reconstructing Appellants' claims are clearly impermissible. Moreover, the Examiner does not explain why one skilled in the art at the time of Appellants' invention would seek to modify SHANKER et al. or PURCELL et al. to include means for translating a nature of address indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format.

Appellants note that while SHANKAR et al. may disclose the session initiation protocol, SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests means for translating a nature of address indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim

40. The Examiner cannot reasonably rely on SHANKAR et al. for disclosing this feature of claim 40 since the Examiner admits that SHANKAR et al. does not disclose mapping a nature of address indicator (final Office Action, p. 5).

Nonetheless, col. 1, lines 25-37 of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above and discloses that the term "legacy systems" includes SIP. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests means for translating a nature of address indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 40. In fact, this section of SHANKAR et al. in no way relates to translating.

Col. 2, lines 44-67 of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above and discloses a signaling apparatus that implements protocol conversion between the legacy systems and the packet-switching network. This section of SHANKAR et al. further discloses a coding unit that converts bearer voice traffic between legacy and packet formats. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests means for translating a nature of address indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 40.

Col. 5, lines 15-32 of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above and discloses that a signaling unit converts legacy protocols, such as SIP, of originating node 100 and terminating node 160 into messages for communicating with one another and for controlling a coding unit over control lines 114 and 154. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests that the conversion of legacy protocols includes means for translating a nature of address indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 40.

With respect to PURCELL et al., Appellants note that PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest a session initiation protocol format. Therefore, the Examiner cannot reasonably rely

on PURCELL et al. for disclosing means for translating a nature of address indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 40.

Nonetheless, col. 3, lines 5-14, of PURCELL et al. is reproduced above and discloses the conversion of signals in a format associated with a first international communications network into a different format required by a second international communications network. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest means for translating a nature of address indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 40.

Col. 4, lines 50-57, of PURCELL et al. is reproduced above and discloses the use of conversion tables for translating messages from the North American message format into a foreign message format. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest means for translating a nature of address indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 40.

At col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37, PURCELL et al. discloses mapping tables that can be used in translating of ANSI Signaling Connection Control Part (SCCP) global title formats and values into the ITU SCCP global title formats and values. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest means for translating a nature of address indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 40.

The Abstract of PURCELL et al. is reproduced above and discloses protocol conversion between different mobile networks. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest means for translating a nature of address indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 40.

Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. depict mapping tables used in the translation of ANSI SCCP global title formats and values into ITU SCCP global title formats and values. These figures (and their corresponding description) specifically disclose that the translation of an ANSI SS7 protocol to an ITU SS7 protocol is based on a translation type value. For example, at col. 8, lines 4-9, PURCELL et al. specifically discloses, with reference to Fig. 6a:

The gateway unit 90 performs this translation by equating the Translation Type=9 (123) to the Numbering Plan=ITU E.212 (125), Encoding Scheme=BCD Odd/Even 127, and Nature of Address Indicator=International 129, used in the ITU SS7 protocol.

(Emphasis added). Therefore, in stark contrast to the above feature of claim 40, PURCELL et al. discloses the mapping of a translation type value to numbering plan, encoding scheme, and nature of address indicator values of a different protocol. PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest means for translating a nature of address indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 40. In fact, as indicated above, PURCELL et al. does not even mention the session initiation protocol.

SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. do not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 40. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claim 40.

Appellants further submit that one skilled in the art at the time of Appellants' invention would not have been motivated to incorporate PURCELL et al.'s alleged nature of address conversion into the SHANKAR et al. system, absent impermissible hindsight. With respect to motivation, the Examiner alleges:

it would have been obvious ... to incorporate both an NOA and NPI within Shanker so as to allow for continuous and smooth interconnect of communications path between different network interfaces



(final Office Action, p. 6). Appellants submit that the Examiner's allegation is merely a conclusory statement regarding an alleged benefit of the combination. Such motivation statements are insufficient for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In this respect, Appellants rely upon KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (April 30, 2007) (citing In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)), where it was held that rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. Appellants submit that the Examiner's purported motivation to combine the cited references is merely conclusory and based on impermissible hindsight.

Moreover, the Examiner believes it is reasonable to conclude that incorporating a nature of address indicator and a numbering plan indicator into the SHANKAR et al. system would "allow for continuous and smooth interconnect of communications path between different network interfaces." Thus, by incorporating these two indicators into the SHANKAR et al. system, the Examiner believes that it is reasonable to conclude that the SHANKAR et al. system would somehow be capable of a continuous and smooth interconnect of a communications path between different network interfaces. Appellants submit that this allegation is far-fetched at best. Clearly, the Examiner's motivation for combining pieces of two different documents to reconstruct the above feature of claim 40 is impermissibly based on hindsight.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

14. Claim 42.

Claim 42 depends from claim 39. Therefore, claim 42 is patentable over SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 39. Moreover, this claim recites an additional feature not disclosed or suggested by SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al.

Claim 42 recites that the second format includes one of signaling system 7 (SS7) format, integrated services digital network (ISDN) format, ISDN user part (ISUP) format, or channel associated signaling (CAS) format. The Examiner relies on col. 1, lines 25-37, and col. 4, line 50 to col. 5, line 27, of SHANKAR et al. for allegedly disclosing this feature (final Office Action, p. 6). At the outset, Appellants note that the Examiner admits that SHANKAR et al. does not disclose mapping a numbering plan indicator (final Office Action, p. 3). Therefore, it is unclear how the Examiner can reasonably rely on SHANKAR et al. for disclosing means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from a session initiation protocol to a second format and means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol, where the second format includes one of SS7 format, ISDN format, ISUP format, or CAS format, as recited in claim 42.

Nonetheless, col. 1, lines 25-37, of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above and discloses that the term "legacy systems" includes ISDN\_PRI, DPNSS, ISUP, TUP, NUP, H.323, and SIP. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from a session initiation protocol to a second format and means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol, where the second format includes one of SS7 format, ISDN format, ISUP format, or CAS format, as recited in claim 42. In fact, this section of SHANKAR et al. in no way relates to mapping.

At col. 4, line 50 to col. 5, line 27, SHANKAR et al. discloses that originating signaling unit 120 and terminating signaling unit 140 convert the legacy protocols, such as DPNSS, ISDN\_PRI, SS7/C7 (including ISUPs, TUPs, and NUPs), H.323, SIP, or CAS, of originating node 100 and terminating node 160 into messages for communicating with one another and for controlling a coding unit over control lines 114 and 154. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests that the conversion of legacy protocols includes means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from a session initiation protocol to a second format and means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol, where the second format includes one of SS7 format, ISDN format, ISUP format, or CAS format, as recited in claim 42.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

15. Claim 43.

Independent claim 43 is directed to a system comprising a network device to translate a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translate a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format. SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

The Examiner relies on col. 1, lines 30-37, col. 2, lines 44-67, and col. 5, lines 15-32, of SHANKAR et al. for allegedly disclosing converting to a session initiation protocol and on col. 3, lines 5-14, col. 4, lines 50-57, col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37, the Abstract, and Figs. 6a-6c of

PURCELL et al. for allegedly disclosing mapping a nature of address indicator and a numbering plan indicator (final Office Action, pp. 2-6). Appellants submit that the Examiner's piecemeal examination of the above feature of claim 43 is clearly unreasonable.

Instead of addressing the features of a network device to translate a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translate a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, the Examiner breaks the features down into illogical parts by pointing to portions of one reference for allegedly disclosing converting a session initiation protocol format to a second format or from the second format to the session initiation protocol format and to unrelated portions of a second reference for allegedly disclosing mapping a nature of address indicator and a numbering plan indicator. Such attempts at reconstructing Appellants' claims are clearly impermissible. Moreover, the Examiner does not explain why one skilled in the art at the time of Appellants' invention would seek to modify SHANKER et al. or PURCELL et al. to include a network device to translate a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translate a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format.

Appellants submit that while SHANKAR et al. may disclose the session initiation protocol, SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests a network device to translate a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translate a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 43. The Examiner cannot reasonably rely on SHANKAR et al. for disclosing these features of claim 43 since the Examiner admits that SHANKAR et al. does

not disclose mapping a nature of address indicator and a numbering plan indicator (final Office Action, p. 3).

Nonetheless, col. 1, lines 25-37, of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above. This section of SHANKAR et al. discloses that the term "legacy systems" includes the session initiation protocol (SIP). This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests a network device to translate a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translate a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 43. In fact, this section of SHANKAR et al. in no way relates to translating.

Col. 2, lines 44-67, of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above. This section of SHANKAR et al. discloses a signaling apparatus that implements protocol conversion between the legacy systems and the packet-switching network. This section of SHANKAR et al. further discloses a coding unit that converts bearer voice traffic between legacy and packet formats. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests a network device to translate a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translate a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 43.

Col. 5, lines 15-32, of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above. This section of SHANKAR et al. discloses that a signaling unit converts legacy protocols, such as SIP, of originating node 100 and terminating node 160 into messages for communicating with one another and for controlling a coding unit over control lines 114 and 154. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests that the conversion of legacy protocols

includes a network device to translate a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translate a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 43.

With respect to PURCELL et al., Appellants note that PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest a session initiation protocol format. Therefore, the Examiner cannot reasonably rely on PURCELL et al. for disclosing a network device to translate a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translate a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 43.

Nonetheless, col. 3, lines 5-14, of PURCELL et al. is reproduced above. This section of PURCELL et al. discloses the conversion of signals in a format associated with a first international communications network into a different format required by a second international communications network. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest a network device to translate a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translate a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 43.

Col. 4, lines 50-57, PURCELL et al. is reproduced above. This section of PURCELL et al. discloses the use of conversion tables for translating messages from the North American message format into a foreign message format. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest a network device to translate a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translate a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 43.

At col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37, PURCELL et al. discloses mapping tables that can be used in translating ANSI Signaling Connection Control Part (SCCP) global title formats and values into the ITU SCCP global title formats and values. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest a network device to translate a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translate a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 43.

The Abstract of PURCELL et al. is reproduced above. This section of PURCELL et al. discloses protocol conversion between different mobile networks. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest a network device to translate a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translate a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 43.

Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. depict mapping tables used in the translation of ANSI SCCP global title formats and values into ITU SCCP global title formats and values. These figures (and their corresponding description) specifically disclose that the translation of an ANSI SS7 protocol to an ITU SS7 protocol is based on a translation type value. For example, at col. 8, lines 4-9, PURCELL et al. specifically discloses, with reference to Fig. 6a:

The gateway unit 90 performs this translation by equating the Translation Type=9 (123) to the Numbering Plan=ITU E.212 (125), Encoding Scheme=BCD Odd/Even 127, and Nature of Address Indicator=International 129, used in the ITU SS7 protocol.

(Emphasis added). Therefore, in stark contrast to the above feature of claim 43, PURCELL et al. discloses the mapping of a translation type value to numbering plan, encoding scheme, and nature of address indicator values of a different protocol. PURCELL et al. does not disclose or

suggest a network device to translate a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translate a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 43. In fact, as indicated above, PURCELL et al. does not even mention the session initiation protocol.

With respect to the above arguments, the Examiner alleges that Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. show examples of mapping tables used in the translation process between ANSI and ITU formats and points to col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37 (discussed above) of PURCELL et al. for support (final Office Action, p. 7). Regardless of the veracity of the Examiner's allegation, PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest a network device to translate a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translate a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 43.

Further in response to the above arguments, the Examiner provides definitions of "nature of address" and "numbering plan indicator" and the Examiner's impressions of how telecommunication switches typically work (final Office Action, p. 7).

Contrary to the Examiner's definition, a numbering plan indicator, as the name suggests, is a value that identifies a numbering plan for a call. For example, a numbering plan indicator value of "1" indicates an ISDN telephony call, according to the E.164 numbering plan.

Moreover, Appellants submit that the Examiner's characterization of the operations of telecommunication switches (regardless of its veracity) does not remedy the fact that neither SHANKAR et al. nor PURCELL et al. discloses or suggests a network device to translate a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and



translate a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 43. As indicated above, Appellants submit that the Examiner's piecemeal examination of this feature (by pointing to SHANKAR et al. for disclosing the session initiation protocol and PURCELL et al. for disclosing translation of ANSI SCCP global title formats and values into ITU SCCP global title formats and values) is unreasonable.

SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. do not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 43. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claim 43.

Appellants further submit that one skilled in the art at the time of Appellants' invention would not have been motivated to incorporate PURCELL et al.'s alleged nature of address conversion and numbering plan conversion into the SHANKAR et al. system, absent impermissible hindsight. With respect to motivation, the Examiner alleges:

it would have been obvious ... to incorporate both an NOA and NPI within Shanker so as to allow for continuous and smooth interconnect of communications path between different network interfaces

(final Office Action, pp. 4 and 8). Appellants submit that the Examiner's allegation is merely a conclusory statement regarding an alleged benefit of the combination. Such motivation statements are insufficient for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In this respect, Appellants rely upon KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (April 30, 2007) (citing In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)), where it was held that rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. Appellants submit that the Examiner's purported motivation to combine the cited

references is merely conclusory and based on impermissible hindsight.

Moreover, the Examiner believes it is reasonable to conclude that incorporating a nature of address indicator and a numbering plan indicator into the SHANKAR et al. system would "allow for continuous and smooth interconnect of communications path between different network interfaces." Thus, by incorporating these two indicators into the SHANKAR et al. system, the Examiner believes that it is reasonable to conclude that the SHANKAR et al. system would somehow be capable of a continuous and smooth interconnect of a communications path between different network interfaces. Appellants submit that this allegation is far-fetched at best and not supported by any facts. Clearly, the Examiner's motivation for combining pieces of two different documents to reconstruct the above feature of claim 43 is impermissibly based on hindsight.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

16. Claims 44 and 45.

Independent claim 44 is directed to a method for translating data. The method comprises translating a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format. SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

The Examiner relies on col. 1, lines 30-37, col. 2, lines 44-67, and col. 5, lines 15-32, of SHANKAR et al. for allegedly disclosing converting to a session initiation protocol and on col.

3, lines 5-14, col. 4, lines 50-57, col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37, the Abstract, and Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. for allegedly disclosing mapping a nature of address indicator and a numbering plan indicator (final Office Action, pp. 2-6). Appellants submit that the Examiner's piecemeal examination of the above feature of claim 44 is clearly unreasonable.

Instead of addressing the features of translating a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format and translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, the Examiner breaks the features down into illogical parts by pointing to portions of one reference for allegedly disclosing converting a session initiation protocol format to a second format or from the second format to the session initiation protocol format and to unrelated portions of a second reference for allegedly disclosing mapping a nature of address indicator and a numbering plan indicator. Such attempts at reconstructing Appellants' claims are clearly impermissible. Moreover, the Examiner does not explain why one skilled in the art at the time of Appellants' invention would seek to modify SHANKER et al. or PURCELL et al. to include translating a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format.

Appellants submit that while SHANKAR et al. may disclose the session initiation protocol, SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests translating a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 44. The Examiner cannot reasonably rely on SHANKAR et al. for disclosing these features of claim 44 since the Examiner admits that SHANKAR et al. does not disclose

mapping a nature of address indicator and a numbering plan indicator (final Office Action, p. 3).

Nonetheless, col. 1, lines 25-37, of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above. This section of SHANKAR et al. discloses that the term "legacy systems" includes the session initiation protocol (SIP). This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests translating a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 44. In fact, this section of SHANKAR et al. in no way relates to translating.

Col. 2, lines 44-67, of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above. This section of SHANKAR et al. discloses a signaling apparatus that implements protocol conversion between the legacy systems and the packet-switching network. This section of SHANKAR et al. further discloses a coding unit that converts bearer voice traffic between legacy and packet formats. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests translating a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 44.

Col. 5, lines 15-32, of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above. This section of SHANKAR et al. discloses that a signaling unit converts legacy protocols, such as SIP, of originating node 100 and terminating node 160 into messages for communicating with one another and for controlling a coding unit over control lines 114 and 154. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests that the conversion of legacy protocols includes translating a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and

a second format, and translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 44.

With respect to PURCELL et al., Appellants note that PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest a session initiation protocol format. Therefore, the Examiner cannot reasonably rely on PURCELL et al. for disclosing translating a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 44.

Nonetheless, col. 3, lines 5-14, of PURCELL et al. is reproduced above. This section of PURCELL et al. discloses the conversion of signals in a format associated with a first international communications network into a different format required by a second international communications network. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest translating a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 44.

Col. 4, lines 50-57, PURCELL et al. is reproduced above. This section of PURCELL et al. discloses the use of conversion tables for translating messages from the North American message format into a foreign message format. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest translating a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 44.

At col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37, PURCELL et al. discloses mapping tables that can be used in translating ANSI Signaling Connection Control Part (SCCP) global title formats and

values into the ITU SCCP global title formats and values. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest translating a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 44.

The Abstract of PURCELL et al. is reproduced above. This section of PURCELL et al. discloses protocol conversion between different mobile networks. This section of PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest translating a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 44.

Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. depict mapping tables used in the translation of ANSI SCCP global title formats and values into ITU SCCP global title formats and values. These figures (and their corresponding description) specifically disclose that the translation of an ANSI SS7 protocol to an ITU SS7 protocol is based on a translation type value. For example, at col. 8, lines 4-9, PURCELL et al. specifically discloses, with reference to Fig. 6a:

The gateway unit 90 performs this translation by equating the Translation Type=9 (123) to the Numbering Plan=ITU E.212 (125), Encoding Scheme=BCD Odd/Even 127, and Nature of Address Indicator=International 129, used in the ITU SS7 protocol.

(Emphasis added). Therefore, in stark contrast to the above feature of claim 44, PURCELL et al. discloses the mapping of a translation type value to numbering plan, encoding scheme, and nature of address indicator values of a different protocol. PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest translating a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 44. In fact, as indicated above,

PURCELL et al. does not even mention the session initiation protocol.

With respect to the above arguments, the Examiner alleges that Figs. 6a-6c of PURCELL et al. show examples of mapping tables used in the translation process between ANSI and ITU formats and points to col. 7, line 37 to col. 8, line 37 (discussed above) of PURCELL et al. for support (final Office Action, p. 7). Regardless of the veracity of the Examiner's allegation, PURCELL et al. does not disclose or suggest translating a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 44.

Further in response to the above arguments, the Examiner provides definitions of "nature of address" and "numbering plan indicator" and the Examiner's impressions of how telecommunication switches typically work (final Office Action, p. 7).

Contrary to the Examiner's definition, a numbering plan indicator, as the name suggests, is a value that identifies a numbering plan for a call. For example, a numbering plan indicator value of "1" indicates an ISDN telephony call, according to the E.164 numbering plan.

Moreover, Appellants submit that the Examiner's characterization of the operations of telecommunication switches (regardless of its veracity) does not remedy the fact that neither SHANKAR et al. nor PURCELL et al. discloses or suggests translating a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, as recited in claim 44. As indicated above, Appellants submit that the Examiner's piecemeal examination of this feature (by pointing to SHANKAR et al. for disclosing the session initiation protocol and PURCELL et al. for disclosing translation of ANSI SCCP global title formats and

values into ITU SCCP global title formats and values) is unreasonable.

SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. do not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 44. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claim 44.

Appellants further submit that one skilled in the art at the time of Appellants' invention would not have been motivated to incorporate PURCELL et al.'s alleged nature of address conversion and numbering plan conversion into the SHANKAR et al. system, absent impermissible hindsight. With respect to motivation, the Examiner alleges:

it would have been obvious ... to incorporate both an NOA and NPI within Shanker so as to allow for continuous and smooth interconnect of communications path between different network interfaces

(final Office Action, pp. 4 and 8). Appellants submit that the Examiner's allegation is merely a conclusory statement regarding an alleged benefit of the combination. Such motivation statements are insufficient for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In this respect, Appellants rely upon KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (April 30, 2007) (citing In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)), where it was held that rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. Appellants submit that the Examiner's purported motivation to combine the cited references is merely conclusory and based on impermissible hindsight.

Moreover, the Examiner believes it is reasonable to conclude that incorporating a nature of address indicator and a numbering plan indicator into the SHANKAR et al. system would "allow for continuous and smooth interconnect of communications path between different



network interfaces." Thus, by incorporating these two indicators into the SHANKAR et al. system, the Examiner believes that it is reasonable to conclude that the SHANKAR et al. system would somehow be capable of a continuous and smooth interconnect of a communications path between different network interfaces. Appellants submit that this allegation is far-fetched at best and not supported by any facts. Clearly, the Examiner's motivation for combining pieces of two different documents to reconstruct the above feature of claim 44 is impermissibly based on hindsight.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

Claim 45 depends from claim 44. Therefore, Appellants request that the rejection of claim 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. be reversed for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 44.

17. Claim 46.

Claim 46 depends from claim 44. Therefore, claim 46 is patentable over SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 44. Moreover, this claim recites an additional feature not disclosed or suggested by SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al.

Claim 46 recites that the second format includes one of signaling system 7 (SS7) format, integrated services digital network (ISDN) format, ISDN user part (ISUP) format, or channel associated signaling (CAS) format. The Examiner relies on col. 1, lines 25-37, and col. 4, line 50 to col. 5, line 27, of SHANKAR et al. for allegedly disclosing this feature (final Office Action, p.

6). At the outset, Appellants note that the Examiner admits that SHANKAR et al. does not disclose translating a nature of address indicator or translating a numbering plan indicator (final Office Action, p. 3). Therefore, it is unclear how the Examiner can reasonably rely on SHANKAR et al. for disclosing translating a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, where the second format includes one of SS7 format, ISDN format, ISUP format, or CAS format, as recited in claim 46.

Nonetheless, col. 1, lines 25-37, of SHANKAR et al. is reproduced above and discloses that the term "legacy systems" includes ISDN\_PRI, DPNSS, ISUP, TUP, NUP, H.323, and SIP. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests translating a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format, where the second format includes one of SS7 format, ISDN format, ISUP format, or CAS format, as recited in claim 46. In fact, this section of SHANKAR et al. in no way relates to translating.

At col. 4, line 50 to col. 5, line 27, SHANKAR et al. discloses that originating signaling unit 120 and terminating signaling unit 140 convert the legacy protocols, such as DPNSS, ISDN\_PRI, SS7/C7 (including ISUPs, TUPs, and NUPs), H.323, SIP, or CAS, of originating node 100 and terminating node 160 into messages for communicating with one another and for controlling a coding unit over control lines 114 and 154. This section of SHANKAR et al. in no way discloses or suggests that the conversion of legacy protocols includes translating a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the

second format, where the second format includes one of SS7 format, ISDN format, ISUP format, or CAS format, as recited in claim 46.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on SHANKAR et al. and PURCELL et al. is improper. Accordingly, Appellants request that the rejection be reversed.

#### VIII. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing arguments, Appellants respectfully solicit the Honorable Board to reverse the Examiner's rejections of claims 25-27, 29-32, 34-36, 38-40, and 42-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: /John E. Harrity/  
John E. Harrity  
Registration No. 43,367

Date: May 29, 2007

11350 Random Hills Road  
Suite 600  
Fairfax, Virginia 22030  
(571) 432-0800

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 25537

IX. CLAIM APPENDIX

25. A method for establishing a telephone call, comprising:  
receiving a call establishment request;  
mapping a nature of address indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format; and  
establishing the telephone call based on the mapping.
26. The method of claim 25 further comprising:  
mapping a numbering plan indicator from the first format to the session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format.
27. The method of claim 26 wherein the establishing is further based on the mapping of the numbering plan indicator.
29. The method of claim 25 wherein the first format includes one of signaling system 7 (SS7) format, integrated services digital network (ISDN) format, ISDN user part (ISUP) format, or channel associated signaling (CAS) format.
30. A method for establishing a telephone call, comprising:  
receiving a call establishment request;  
mapping a numbering plan indicator from a first format to a session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format; and

establishing the telephone call based on the mapping.

31. The method of claim 30 further comprising:

mapping a nature of address indicator from the first format to the session initiation protocol format or from the session initiation protocol format to the first format.

32. The method of claim 31 wherein the establishing is further based on the mapping of the nature of address indicator.

34. The method of claim 30 wherein the first format includes one of signaling system 7 (SS7) format, integrated services digital network (ISDN) format, ISDN user part (ISUP) format, or channel associated signaling (CAS) format.

35. A system comprising:

means for mapping a nature of address indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format; and

means for mapping a nature of address indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format.

36. The system of claim 35 further comprising:

means for translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format.

38. The system of claim 35 wherein the second format includes one of signaling system 7 (SS7) format, integrated services digital network (ISDN) format, ISDN user part (ISUP) format, or channel associated signaling (CAS) format.

39. A system for establishing a call, comprising:  
means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from a session initiation protocol format to a second format; and  
means for mapping a numbering plan indicator from the second format to the session initiation protocol format.

40. The system of claim 39 further comprising:  
means for translating a nature of address indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format.

42. The system of claim 39 wherein the second format includes one of signaling system 7 (SS7) format, integrated services digital network (ISDN) format, ISDN user part (ISUP) format, or channel associated signaling (CAS) format.

43. A system comprising:  
a network device to:

translate a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format, and

translate a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format.

44. A method for translating data, comprising:

translating a nature of address indicator between a session initiation protocol format and a second format; and

translating a numbering plan indicator between the session initiation protocol format and the second format.

45. The method of claim 44 wherein the second format includes a telephony signaling protocol.

46. The method of claim 44 wherein the second format includes one of signaling system 7 (SS7) format, integrated services digital network (ISDN) format, ISDN user part (ISUP) format, or channel associated signaling (CAS) format.



X. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

XI. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.